

requires sponsors of immigrants to take greater responsibility for those they bring into the United States by making the affidavit of support which they sign a legally binding document.

The bill also counts the sponsor's income as part of the immigrant's income for purposes of determining eligibility for public assistance, a process known as deeming for an expanded range of public assistance programs. I believe this provision is in line with immigrants' pledge of self-sufficiency and that they will not become a public charge. By expanding the number of programs that require deeming, we are holding immigrants to their commitment and requiring their sponsors, not the Government, take responsibility for them. I supported a Simon amendment that would have eliminated retroactive deeming requirements in the bill. I believe in deeming requirements to assure that sponsors and the legal immigrants that they sponsor meet the responsibilities they have promised to meet, but I think it's unfair to apply new rules after the fact to those who are already here. Unfortunately, that amendment was defeated.

I voted for a Kennedy amendment that would have excluded pregnant women, children and veterans from deeming requirements for Medicaid. Unfortunately, that amendment was also defeated.

Under the bill, illegal immigrants, who have broken U.S. laws and have no legal right to be here, are prohibited from using any Federal, State, or local benefit, with minor exceptions related to public health interests.

Mr. President, in conclusion, it is time we dealt firmly and directly with illegal immigration. This bill, while not perfect, makes a good effort to put in place the procedures and resources necessary to reduce illegal immigration. •

#### CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, on Thursday of last week, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported favorably, by a 13 to 5 vote, the resolution of ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention [CWC]. I applaud the committee's action and the leadership of Senators LUGAR, PELL, KASSEBAUM, KERRY, and BIDEN, not to mention the hard work of the committee staff, to advance this major arms control treaty. I hope that floor consideration can be scheduled as early as possible. While I realize that there may be difficulties on the floor, this treaty is of such importance that it would be an abrogation of our responsibility, when it is out of committee and ready to go, not to provide advice and consent before the end of this Congress.

I note that Majority Leader DOLE stated on December 7 of last year that it was his intention that the Senate would consider the Convention in a reasonable time period once the Convention is on the Executive Calendar.

Well, the Chemical Weapons Convention is now on the calendar, and the reasonable time clock is ticking.

As all major arms control treaties must be, the CWC is a bipartisan measure. It was negotiated during the Reagan administration, signed by President Bush, and submitted to the Senate by President Clinton. It was approved by a strong bipartisan majority of the Foreign Relations Committee. It is endorsed by arms control advocates and the Chemical Manufacturers Association. Some critics of the CWC have sought to blame the Democrats for failing to ratify the Convention when they controlled the Senate. Yes, the Senate should have acted on the CWC in 1994, but that fact does not provide a reason not to act in 1996. The sooner we can ratify the Convention, the sooner we can eliminate these horrible weapons.

While U.S. accession to the treaty is not a legal requirement for the treaty to enter into force, it has become a practical requirement. The case of the CWC is yet another example of the continued primacy of U.S. leadership in international politics. Ratification by 65 countries is necessary for the CWC to enter into force. Currently, only 49 have done so, and it has become clear that many are waiting for U.S. ratification. Why? For one, because the United States maintains one of the two largest stockpiles of chemical weapons. But more fundamentally, because nations continue to look to the United States for leadership in matters of great international import. President George Bush wrote in 1994: "United States leadership is required once again to bring this historic agreement into force." This remains true today. Prompt action is our responsibility.

Critics of the CWC, and there appear to be few, argue that U.S. security is harmed by our approval of a treaty that binds us to destroy a class of weapons we currently possess, while citing that certain "rogue" states have not signed the treaty and raising questions over Russian compliance. They argue that, by proceeding to eliminate its chemical weapons stockpile under the CWC, the United States is depriving itself of a deterrent capability against any state that maintains some CW capacity. However, deterrence is based on the ability to respond in kind, and that assumes that chemical weapons are a legitimate instrument of warfare for the U.S. military.

The fundamental basis behind the CWC, however, is that chemical weapons are not legitimate for war-fighting. This consensus goes back to World War I, where the invidious use of mustard gas prompted the 1925 Geneva Protocol to prohibit the use of chemical warfare agents. More recently, the Iraqi attacks on the Kurds in 1988 and the Sarin gas attack on the Tokyo subway last year have reminded the international community of the terror of chemical weapons. Try as we might to stigmatize chemical weapons through other means, there can be no sub-

stitute for, in the words of President Bush's National Security Advisor Gen. Brent Scowcroft, "the clear international norms against chemical weapons, the legal framework, and the challenge inspections embodied in the Chemical Weapons Convention."

A chemical weapons deterrent capability for the United States is not only unnecessary, it is inconceivable. If U.S. troops or territory were subject to a chemical attack, our military has ample means to respond in conventional ways, if a military response were deemed appropriate. Defense Secretary William Perry testified last month to the Foreign Relations Committee that "we have an effective range of capabilities to protect against, to deter, or to retaliate against the use of chemical weapons \* \* \*". JCS Chairman Gen. John Shalikashvili testified in 1994 that "while forgoing the ability to retaliate in kind, the U.S. military retains the wherewithal to deter and defend against a chemical attack." Additionally, I doubt that many Americans would feel comfortable with having a military that is prepared to wage gas attacks on foreign populations. In essence, how could we ask the world to make illegal these weapons, if we reserve the right to their legitimate use?

There are a number of other criticisms of the CWC to address, and I hope to do so at a later time. Simply put, the CWC will improve our national security by establishing the legal basis, the timetable and the verification regime necessary to ban chemical weapons. I am pleased that the Foreign Relations Committee has finally reported out the Convention, and I hope that we can proceed to give our advice and consent as soon as possible. •

#### THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION BUDGET

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, just to follow up very briefly on what the majority leader said, the Wall Street Journal earlier this week pointed out that the tax increases in 1993 had the effect of costing jobs and economic growth in this country. Two economists, William Beach and Scott Hodge, at the Heritage Foundation, used the very reputable econometric model, the Washington University macro model, to try to figure out what happened as a result of that 1993 budget deal. They calculated it reduced private sector jobs by 1.2 million. We lost \$208 billion in output, or the equivalent of \$2,100 per family. What is worse, they found out the tax increases did not reduce the deficit as much as predicted because tax increases change behavior and not all the taxes were generated. Only about 56 cents of additional deficit reduction came for every \$1 of new taxes. So that did not work very well.

Now the majority leader has talked about how we need to get the budget in balance by cutting spending. I wanted to share very briefly today with my colleagues something that went on in